



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,268	01/31/2000	Michael O. Cimini	13D13211	4650

29399 7590 10/09/2002
JOHN S. BEULICK
C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE
SUITE 2600
ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740

EXAMINER

WOO, ISAAC M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/495,268

Applicant(s)

CIMINI ET AL.

Examiner

Isaac M Woo

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07/23/2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Applicant's Arguments, filed on July 23, 2002 have been considered but are deemed moot in view of new ground of rejections below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandyam et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,989, hereinafter "Mandyam").

With respect to claim 1, Mandyam discloses the plurality of clients, each the client comprising a plurality of user interface classes (FIG. 3, FIG. 4) and at least one class that provides access to a database (FIG. 6), see (col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25; col. 11, lines 5-45);

server (FIG. 3, FIG. 4) comprising a plurality of servlets, at least some of the servlets (with HTML, CGI at server that provide servlet functions) providing at least one

of a database and server access capability to each client, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, FIG. 6, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25, col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-45).

Mandyam discloses the database accessed by each client via the server, see (FIG. 6, col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-45). Mandyam discloses the database comprising a plurality of tables which is inherent in database structure. Mandyam does not explicitly disclose at least one of the tables comprising at least one error proofing example and meta-data defined by a user when creating an error proofing example. However, Mandyam teaches that help desk application provides help document with HTML forms from application help database to a client, see (FIG. 6, col. 2, 18-67 to col. 3, lines 1-67 to col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-45). Error proofing example that provides information as document form which is displayed in HTML forms (meta-data) to a client user. And the information of the error proofing example is same as help information that provides any kinds of information (such as, troubleshooting, error checking, product processing, etc.,). One of the error proofing example is one of the help information that depends on the application of help desk. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art to include at least one of the tables comprising at least one error proofing example and meta-data defined by a user when creating an error proofing example into the system of Mandyam to provide an error proofing example information to a client user. Web-based help desk application can provide any help information which can be also error proofing example information to a user. Thus, it would be beneficial to use web-based help desk application to get information to check an error proofing procedures.

With respect to claim 2, Mandyam discloses that each user interface classes comprises at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 4, col. 7, lines 5-44, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 3, Mandyam discloses that one of the user interface classes constructs and displays a menu of web pages that user can view, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 4, col. 7, lines 5-44, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 4, Mandyam discloses that one of the user interface classes initializes and displays forms, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 4, col. 7, lines 5-44, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 5, Mandyam discloses that the class that provides access to the database formats SQL statements and invokes request to servlets in the server that provide database access, see (FIG. 7, col. 11, lines 46-67 to col. 12, lines 1-32).

With respect to claim 6, Mandyam discloses that the server (FIG. 3, FIG. 4) comprises servlets (88, FIG. 4, HTTP server and responds to requests from clients) for database queries and updating, uploading a document and updating the database,

downloading a document and extracting user permissions from the database, see (FIG. 7, col. 11, lines 45-67 to col. 12, lines 1-20).

With respect to claims 7, 8 and 9, Mandyam discloses that one of the tables stores process to which an error proofing example applies and failure modes associated with an error proofing example, part families and solution stage, see (FIG. 6, FIG. 7, col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-67 to col. 12, lines 1-20), Note: help pages provides information for troubleshooting that includes failures, related problems and solutions, which is well known in on-line help system).

With respect to claim 10, Mandyam discloses that one of the tables data identifying users of the error proofing web site, see (col. 6, lines 45-67 to col. 7, lines 1-45).

With respect to claim 11, Mandyam discloses that one of the tables stores textual data relating to the error proofing example, see (col. 1, lines 21-67 to col. 2, lines 1-17).

With respect to claim 12, Mandyam discloses that one of the tables stores a principle and related strategy that are associated with an error proofing example, see (FIG. 6, FIG. 7, col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-67 to col. 12, lines 1-20, Note: help pages provides information for troubleshooting that includes failures, related problems

and solutions, which is well known in on-line help system. And principles and related strategy are contents of the help pages).

With respect to claim 13, Mandyam disclose that the method for identifying an error technique for a given application, using a web-based system (FIG. 3, FIG. 4), the system including a plurality of clients including a plurality of user interface classes (FIG. 3, FIG. 4), a server including a plurality of servlets (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, HTML, CGI at server that provide servlet functions), and a database including of tables (FIG. 6), see (col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25; col. 11, lines 5-45),

using at least one interface class to provide access to a database, see (FIG. 6, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25; col. 11, lines 5-45);

using at least some of the servlets to provide at least one of the database (FIG. 6, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25; col. 11, lines 5-45) and server access to capability to a client, see (FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25, col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-45);

accessing a table, see (FIG. 6, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25; col. 11, lines 5-45), and;

choosing a technique to fit the given application, see (col. 5, lines 5-41).

Mandyam does not explicitly disclose accessing a table containing an error proofing example. However, Mandyam teaches that help desk application provides help document with HTML forms from application help database to a client, see (FIG. 6, col. 2, 18-67 to col. 3, lines 1-67 to col. 4, lines 1-24; col. 10, lines 44-67 to col. 11, lines 1-

45). Error proofing example that provides information as document form which is displayed in HTML forms to a client user. And the information of the error proofing example is same as help information that provides any kinds of information (such as, troubleshooting, error checking, product processing, etc.,). One of the error proofing example is one of the help information that depends on the application of help desk. Therefore, it would have been obvious a person having ordinary skill in the art to include accessing a table containing an error proofing example into the system of Mandyam to provide an error proofing example information to a client user. Web-based help desk application can provide any help information which can be also error proofing example information to a user. Thus, it would be beneficial to use web-based help desk application to get information to check an error proofing procedures.

With respect to claim 14, Mandyam discloses that at least one interface class to provide access to a database, providing at least tow visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 4, col. 7, lines 5-44, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 15, Mandyam discloses that the providing at least tow visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input comprises the constructing and displaying a menu of web pages that a user can view, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 7, lines 5-44, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 16, Mandyam discloses that the providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input comprises the initializing and displaying forms, see (FIG. 2, FIG. 3, FIG. 4, col. 7, lines 5-44, col. 8, lines 39-67 to col. 9, lines 1-25).

With respect to claim 17, Mandyam discloses that providing access to database formats SQL statements and invoking request to servlets in the server that provide database access, see (FIG. 7, col. 11, lines 46-67 to col. 12, lines 1-32).

With respect to claim 18, Mandyam discloses that querying database, uploading a document and updating the database, and downloading a document and extracting user permission from the database, see (FIG. 6, FIG. 7, col. 11, lines 45-67 to col. 12, lines 1-20).

With respect to claim 19, Mandyam discloses that the storing processes in the table to which an error proofing example applies, see (FIG. 6, col. 10, lines 45-67 to col. 11, lines 1-45).

Claim 20 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given claims above in claims 7-12.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Palmer et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,594,859) discloses the system for displaying video information on displaying means.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0081. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 308-6606 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

IMW
October 2, 2002


KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100